



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Editorial Notes.

Mr. Bowen Home
from The Hague.

On returning from The Hague on the 5th of December, Mr. Herbert W. Bowen, who represented the United States and Venezuela in the preferential treatment case before the Arbitration Court, spoke as follows in reference to the matter:

"The question which was submitted to the Hague tribunal was whether Great Britain, Germany and Italy are entitled, by reason of the war which they instituted against Venezuela, to have their claims paid before the other creditors. The decision of that question will be important, inasmuch as it will establish a precedent that will indicate what methods creditor nations should pursue in future in collecting claims. During the session of the tribunal, which began September 1, the Court heard every possible and impossible argument in favor of warlike methods and every humane and enlightened reason why creditors adopting peaceful methods should not be held to have forfeited their rights to equality of treatment with bellicose creditors. If we were a little further advanced in civilization the distinguished arbitrators would doubtless have been asked to decide that if preferential treatment should be given to any creditor it should be to those who refrained from resorting to war and used their best endeavors to collect their claims by diplomacy. But arbitration is comparatively a new institution, and until the Venezuelan case arose the nations did not regard the Hague tribunal with great favor. It was even thought that some of the strongest nations were opposed to recognizing the tribunal at all. However that may be, the most ardent supporters of arbitration are now quite unanimous in asserting that this Venezuelan case, in which no fewer than twelve nations are interested, has given the Hague tribunal the recognition and respect it needed as the supreme international court of justice and peace. The credit for securing for it this general recognition and respect is due to President Roosevelt. He advised at the beginning of the contention that it should be taken to The Hague."

The judges appointed from the Hague Court to decide the case will announce their decision in February.

The Rush-Bagot
Treaty.

There is said to be a strong feeling in Washington that the Rush-Bagot treaty of 1817, which prevents the United States and Great Britain from keeping war vessels on the great lakes, should be so modified as to permit warships suitable for training purposes to cruise on these waters. A naval board has recommended that the naval training station be located at Lake Bluff, north of Chicago, on the shore of Lake Michigan. Ships' cutters are the only boats that can be used in the training under the terms of the treaty. Modification of the treaty is desired in order that recruiting and training for the navy may be much more extensively carried on in the Middle West than heretofore. The scheme is evidently a part of the

general plan for the great increase in the navy. It is promoted chiefly if not entirely by navy officers, naval boards and the Navy Committee of the House. It would be a very grave mistake, it seems to us, from every point of view, to have this old treaty weakened in any respect. No treaty we have ever made has been more productive of good. It has saved our country many millions of dollars, and has undoubtedly tended to prevent friction and to promote harmonious relations between this country and Canada as well as Great Britain. But for its existence the line of the lakes would have been studded with war vessels, and no one can imagine the amount of mischief that might have come about at the critical periods of our relations with the mother country. If the treaty should be modified in the interests of naval training, it would not be long before the naval promoters and the ship builders would put up a demand for its entire abrogation. Let the treaty stand, and let at least these inland seas be kept free from the curse which has overspread the world, and be kept forever consecrated to peace, as they have been for nearly a hundred years.

Visit of M. P.'s
to Paris.

The visit of members of the British Parliament to Paris the last week in November to return that of the delegation of French Deputies to London in July was one of the notable occurrences in the recent Franco-English *rap-prochement*. The great banquet at the Grand Hotel was pronounced by one of the French guests present "the most brilliant thing of the kind we have ever seen." There were eight hundred persons present, and the after-dinner speaking lasted till midnight. Mr. d'Estournelles de Constant presided. Loud cheers greeted his assurance that the "great demonstration" of the evening was "not the work of one party, but of all parties in France." The president of the Paris Municipal Council, a Nationalist, considered to be of the militant party, was present, signifying thus his sympathy with the great cause. There was a great storm of applause when Mr. d'Estournelles turned to the venerable Frederic Passy, and recalled the history of Mr. Passy's labors as a pioneer in the movement which they were celebrating that night. Sir William Houldsworth, speaking in English for the English, declared that the visits of these two deputations to London and to Paris marked a new era in the world's history, and that such meetings would become perpetual. Commercial relations were of the first importance, but the greatest of the world's interests was peace. The French Prime Minister, in a felicitous speech, signifying his adhesion to the principal of arbitration, declared that the mission of the French and English parliamentary groups was a noble one and that it richly deserved the approbation and the support of

generous minds. The Franco-English treaty just signed reflected the greatest honor on the diplomacy of the two states. But the real source of the success already achieved was the feeling and the conviction of the two peoples. The treaty, though limited, was to be regarded as the fruitful seed of treaties yet to come. The two nations, which had been rivals, — enemies, — were henceforth to confront each other in the world's markets with the armies of peace, the harmless weapons of industry and commerce. Europe, impressed by the happy change, would yield to the new pacific influence. The enthusiasm of the audience became very great when Lord Brassey, speaking in French, declared that they, the English visitors, "admired France heart and soul, that great country of ideas." Lord Avebury, Sir Howard Vincent, Mr. Deschanel, Mr. Cochin and Mr. Jaurès were also among the speakers. The latter in his best style declared that England and France had not made this new compact for themselves alone, but that they might bring, about a united Europe; "their mission was peace humanity, civilization."

**The Nobel
Peace Prize.**

On the 10th of December, the day on which the awarding of the Nobel Peace Prize is annually made, the Committee of the Norwegian Parliament having the matter in charge notified Mr. William Randal Cremer, a member of the British House of Commons, that the prize had this year been given to him. The amount was something over \$39,000. Mr. Cremer has for thirty years been an indefatigable worker for international arbitration. He founded the Workingmen's Arbitration League, afterwards renamed the International Arbitration League, of which he has always been the general secretary. The League has published *The Arbitrator*, of which Mr. Cremer has been the editor. It will be remembered that it was Mr. Cremer who got up the memorial signed by 234 members of the British House of Commons in 1887, and came to this country with the deputation of thirteen distinguished English public men to present the memorial to President Cleveland. It was on his initiative that the Interparliamentary Union was organized in 1889 at the time of the Paris Exposition, an organization which has been most influential in promoting international arbitration and the permanent tribunal. Mr. Cremer was the author of the resolution which passed the House of Commons unanimously in 1893, favoring an arbitration agreement with the United States, and his work did much in preparing the way for the Olney-Pauncefote treaty of 1897 which failed of ratification in our Senate. He has visited the United States three times in the interest of the cause. Though not taking a leading part in the work for the Anglo-French treaty recently signed,

he did effective service in promoting it by arranging for the great reception by one hundred and fifty members of the House of Commons of the d'Estournelles deputation from the French Arbitration Group of the Chamber of Deputies. Mr. Cremer well deserves the recognition given him and his services by the Nobel Committee. He has our warmest congratulations on the honor which has come to him, and through him to all the friends of arbitration and international peace.

**Chambers of
Commerce.**

A movement is on foot to get an expression from the Chambers of Commerce of all our principal cities in favor of the immediate negotiation of a general treaty of arbitration with Great Britain. A meeting of the Boston Chamber of Commerce was held for this purpose on the 16th of December. Dr. Thomas Barclay, who was the leader of the movement among the commercial bodies of Great Britain and France which led to the signing of the Anglo-French treaty, was present in Boston as the guest of Edward Atkinson and addressed the meeting. He gave a most interesting account of the movement among the French and English Chambers of Commerce which led up to the signing of the treaty on the 14th of October last, and said that in England everything was ready for the Anglo-American treaty. On motion of Edward Atkinson a committee of five was appointed by Mr. Wm. H. Lincoln, president of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, with power to fill vacancies and add to its numbers, to organize and develop throughout Massachusetts work in support of a treaty between this country and Great Britain. It is understood that this committee will be enlarged into one representing all sections of Massachusetts, to work in coöperation with committees of other Chambers of Commerce, and with the National Arbitration Committee, founded in 1896, and recently revived at Washington by Hon. John W. Foster, for the purpose of promoting a treaty with Great Britain.

**Difficulty in
the Way.**

Commenting on the address of Dr. Thomas Barclay before the Boston Chamber of Commerce and the interest of commercial bodies in an arbitration treaty with Great Britain, the *Boston Herald* says:

"We are firmly convinced that the great business organizations of the United States will warmly approve of this project, and will do whatever lies in their power to promote its execution; but, unfortunately, the policy of the United States, both in domestic and international matters, is often at variance with the strongly expressed wishes of its representative business men, and, in spite of our great commercial intercourse with Great Britain, — we almost might say our commercial dependency upon the people of that island, — we doubt if there is any

nation with which a general treaty of arbitration could be made with more difficulty. There are hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, of people in the United States who, as the result of traditional prejudices and their own experiences, which perhaps date back to the days of their grandfathers or great-grandfathers, and have absolutely no applicability to present conditions, cannot bring themselves to regard English questions in any way except in the light of hostility. For this reason it has seemed to us that, if the people of the United States wish to form arbitration treaties,—and we certainly trust that they do,—it would be better to begin the good work by arranging a treaty of this kind between France and the United States, following this up with an arbitration treaty between Italy and the United States. After these had been secured a treaty with England could be entered upon with the assurance of easy success, since it would be evident, even to those who are anti-English in their ideas, that we could not afford in this respect to treat that nation in a way different from that we had adopted in our treatment of other nations.”

Monument to Elihu Burritt.

On Tuesday the 15th of December a meeting was held in New Britain, Connecticut, to start a movement to erect in that city a monument to Elihu Burritt. It is strange that the place of this distinguished philanthropist's birth has not long ago honored his memory in this public way. Of Mr. Burritt's many eminent services to the world—and they were many—that in behalf of arbitration and international peace was the greatest, and no American has ever done by word and pen more effective and more abundant work to that end than he. He was a member of that remarkable group of workers in this cause which followed Worcester, Ladd and Channing, the pioneers. To this group belonged Whittier, Garrison, Sumner, William Jay, Dr. Beckwith, Amasa Walker, A. P. Peabody, Gerritt Smith, Samuel J. May, Adin Ballou, Dr. Miles, Howard Malcolm, and others. Of these men only one or two were as advanced and active as Mr. Burritt. From the moral and idealistic point of view his treatment of war and peace left little to be said. But he was also eminently practical, and urged incessantly the practical means of avoiding war. He pleaded for arbitration, for conciliation, for meditation, for an international congress, for a permanent tribunal. His speeches and papers on the subject would make a large volume. In addition to his work in this country, he traveled and labored extensively on the other side of the water. He was one of the handful of men who originated the international peace congress movement in 1841, and made the congresses held in Europe from 1843 to 1853 so remarkably successful. It is only just now that the movement for international peace has begun to tread upon the heels of the ideals of Mr. Burritt, and the proposal for a monument to him is an evidence of the great advance

which has been made in the pathway marked out by him and his friends. Whatever else the New Britain monument may or may not have placed upon it, let it be marked by one at least of his great utterances for the brotherhood and peace of mankind. A dozen of them would be all the better.

Exemption of Private Property.

The recommendation in the President's message in regard to the exemption of private property at sea from capture in time of war ought to have the immediate attention of Congress. It is a curious contradiction that private property on land should long ago have been exempted from capture, while the same law has not been extended to the ocean. So long as nations go to war,—a thing which ought long ago to have been out of date,—it is of course most desirable that the destructions and losses which the hostilities produce should be reduced to the smallest possible limits. The President pleads for the exemption of private property at sea from capture, not only on the grounds of humanity and morals, but also because such “shipping represents, internationally speaking, a much more generalized species of private property than is the case with ordinary property on land—that is, property found at sea is much less apt than is the case with property found on land really to belong to any one nation. Under the modern system of corporate ownership, the flag of a vessel often differs from the flag which would mark the nationality of the real ownership and money control of the vessel; and the cargo may belong to individuals of yet a different nationality. We are glad to see that the President puts under his ban the “commerce destroyer” as not a “vessel of honor.” Every limitation of war is a step in the direction of its ultimate abolition. The public and official opinion which now demands the one will some day as insistently demand the other.

Lord Wolseley's Memoirs.

Nothing recent better illustrates the utterly dehumanizing character of war, and especially of professional soldiering, than the character of Field Marshal Lord Wolseley as exhibited in his Memoirs just published by Scribners. Here we find the same bald doctrine of war as that incidentally advanced in the “Soldier's Pocket Book,” first published over thirty years ago. But it is not in the least “mellowed by age,” as one might expect, but rather intensified in rawness and fierceness. A few quotations will make our meaning clear. “There can be nothing else like it [the charge], or that can approach its inspiration, its intense pride. You are, for the time being,—and it is always short,—lifted up from and out of all petty thoughts of self, and for a moment your whole existence,

soul and body, seems to revel in a true sense of glory. The blood seems to boil, the brain to be on fire. Oh, that I could again hope to experience such sensations." "That war is a horrible thing is a very nice heading for the page of a schoolgirl's copy-book but I confess candidly that I always enjoyed it." To this old fighter war is the supreme sport, better than tiger or boar hunting. The soldier "must believe that his duties are the noblest that fall to man's lot. He must be taught to despise all those of civil life." Without the love of the "glory" that comes by war a nation "will soon pass into the boneless, sinewless condition of the jelly-fish, drifting with every tide and current, and will then cease to be a sharer in the direction of the world's great affairs." The battlefield to him is the pearly gate of heaven! "I did not mind much how many I might lose in action, for *soldiers are made to die* there, and oh, how fortunate they are who do so!" "The heart is easily saddened by thoughts of widows and orphans in order to satisfy war's greedy maw," he confesses; but then he delights in nothing so much as stuffing this greedy maw with husbands and fathers, however many widows and orphans are made thereby. Those who care to wade through the "Memoirs" will find the man of war everywhere portrayed with no drapery and trappings on him, living for the joy of frenzied moments, for the sport of hunting and killing men, for the "glory" of fighting and conquest. This book will hereafter probably become famous as the last of its kind to appear in the history of the race.

Francis E.
Clark.

Dr. Francis E. Clark, president of the United Society of Christian Endeavor, left Boston on Christmas day for another trip round the world, in the interest of the work of the society. His itinerary will include Honolulu, Samoa, Auckland, Tasmania, Melbourne, Sidney, Adelaide, and a trip to Africa, covering a period of more than six months. Just before sailing, Dr. Clark wrote as follows to the Secretary of the American Peace Society:

"*My dear Dr. Trueblood:* I am just about starting for the other side of the world again, but before I start I want to tell you that I am glad of your safe return to America, and glad to hear of the arrangement for your great Peace Convention next fall. The Endeavor movement has been particularly interested in world-wide peace, partly because it stands for world-wide brotherhood, and you will have many sympathetic friends among the young people here in Boston. May it prove to be a great success."

Dr. Clark was one of the fifty eminent persons in the nation who joined in the invitation to the Peace Congress to meet in this country the coming autumn, and he will be one of the large General Committee to promote the interests of the Congress.

Frederic R.
Coudert.

The death of Frederic R. Coudert of New York, on the 20th of December, has taken away one of the most eminent members of the American bar. Mr. Coudert's success as a jury lawyer was phenomenal. As an orator he had few equals. Few men had greater success on the lecture platform, where his efforts were always for charitable purposes. He was actively interested in politics, though he always refused to accept any public position, either at home or abroad. He was deeply interested in the extension of law and equity in the realm of international affairs. For more than twenty years he was a member of the International Law Association and attended some of its conferences abroad. He served also on the International Code Committee of New York, of which David Dudley Field was the president and leader. He was one of the Counsel of the United States before the Behring Sea Arbitration Board at Paris, and made a masterly presentation of the contention of this country. He also served on the Commission which was appointed by President Cleveland to examine the matter of the Venezuelan boundary dispute. His services in international affairs were so highly appreciated that he was decorated with the cross of the Legion of Honor by both the French and the Italian governments.

The Princess
Wiszniewska.

We regret to learn of the death of the Princess Wiszniewska, who passed away at her home in Paris on the 23d of November, after having suffered for a year and more with heart disease. Though of an ancient and eminent family of Burgundy, she had come into prominence herself only in recent years through her efforts to unite the women of the world in a league for the abolition of war. She is said first to have become interested in the cause of peace through the great disasters and sufferings which befell eastern France during the war of 1870. She later, with her husband, Prince Wiszniewska, consecrated herself entirely to the promotion of peace among the nations. She founded, some seven or eight years ago, the Universal Alliance of Women for Disarmament, the name of which was afterwards changed to the Universal Alliance of Women for Peace by Education. Through this organization, with which several millions of women of different countries, by their personal signatures or the adherence of the organizations to which they belonged, had become associated, she carried on an incessant and vigorous propaganda in behalf of the principles of peace. She speedily became known throughout the civilized world, and carried on a very large correspondence. She was an effective speaker, and delivered a number of strong addresses on different occasions. At the opening of the Hague Conference

she sent a memorial to Mr. Bourgeois, the chairman of the French deputation, supported by more than half a million women.

Brevities.

. . . The Grand Duke of Luxemburg has finally ratified the Hague Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, and has appointed as Luxemburg's representative in the Permanent Court of Arbitration Mr. Henri Vannerus, president of the State Council and of the Superior Court of Luxemburg.

. . . President Roosevelt, in the following passage in his message, expresses his desire that Congress may extend the invitation to the Interparliamentary Union to meet at St. Louis this year:

"Last year the Interparliamentary Union for International Arbitration met at Vienna, six hundred members of the different legislatures of civilized countries attending. It was provided that the next meeting should be in 1904 at St. Louis subject to our Congress extending an invitation. Like the Hague Tribunal, this Interparliamentary Union is one of the forces tending towards peace among the nations of the earth, and it is entitled to our support. I trust the invitation can be extended."

. . . The *North American Review* for December contains a most able and enlightening article by P. T. McGrath on Hudson Bay, under the title, "A New Anglo-American Dispute: Is Hudson Bay a Closed Sea?" All persons wishing to keep themselves informed about United States-Canadian relations ought to read this article.

. . . President Roosevelt says that the settlement of the Alaska boundary dispute by the mixed commission of six "furnishes a signal proof of the fairness and good will with which two friendly nations can approach and determine issues involving national sovereignty, and by their nature incapable of submission to a third power for adjudication." But, Mr. President, just such boundary disputes involving national sovereignty have again and again been submitted to third powers. Why are they incapable of submission to a great impartial tribunal like the Hague Court?

. . . To those best informed about the growing tendencies towards liberty and constitutional government in Russia, the proposal to submit the new scheme for peasant reforms, ordered in the Czar's recent manifesto, to the consideration of an elective body to be composed of provincial committees chosen in each province by the Zemstvos, will cause no surprise. This is an entirely new departure for the Russian government. There is a parliamentary smack about it which is said to delight the liberal-minded Russians. It will be difficult long to prevent a violent revolution in Russia unless a peaceful one is accomplished. The soldiers in a number of instances during the recent outbreaks have refused to fire on the peasants.

. . . The government of San Domingo has been induced by United States Minister Powell to agree to appoint arbitrators in the case of the San Domingo Improvement Company.

. . . Congressman Gibson of Tennessee introduced into the House of Representatives on the 11th of December a resolution directing the President to open negotiations with the maritime nations for the purpose of formulating some international agreement whereby the naval armaments of the powers shall be materially reduced.

. . . In compliance with an urgent request from the Cuban authorities, the United States government, on the 11th of December, ordered the removal of the four companies of artillery, which have been kept in the island since its independence was established. For over a year the Cuban government had been objecting strongly to their retention at Havana and Santiago. Because of strong objections also from President Palma, the large display of naval forces, which the United States War Department had intended to make in connection with the opening of the naval station at Guantanamo on the same date, was omitted. It ought, in fairness, never to have been planned.

. . . Edwin D. Mead was one of the speakers at the great memorial meeting held recently in the Auditorium, Chicago, in honor of the late Henry D. Lloyd. While he was in Chicago he gave an address before the Chicago Peace Society and its friends, in which he gave an account of the recent Peace Congress at Rouen, and of the remarkable growth of the peace spirit in Europe.

. . . Hon. William I. Buchanan of Buffalo, ex-Minister to the Argentine Republic and General Counselor of the St. Louis Exposition, has been sent by President Roosevelt on a special mission to Panama. He will be gone till the 1st of February. Just what the nature of the mission is has not been made public. The press was "previous" in its statement that Mr. Buchanan was to be our first regular Minister to "the Republic of Panama." When he is given a Ministry abroad, it ought to be one of the chief Ambassadorships, for he is one of our ablest and most worthy diplomats.

. . . Dr. Thomas Barclay, ex-president of the British Chamber of Commerce in Paris, was the guest of the Massachusetts State Board of Trade at the Vendome Hotel, Boston, on the 15th of December, and spoke briefly on the subject of international arbitration. The Massachusetts Board of Trade will send a memorial to the United States Senate in favor of an Anglo-American arbitration treaty.

. . . The warships of Russia and Japan in the Far East have been painted black, to be ready in the event of war. That is the proper color. If the Russians and Japanese were disposed to do the appropriate thing still farther, they would follow the advice of William E. Channing and dress all their soldiers in black, paint their faces black, put black trappings on their horses, hoist black flags, and have the entire war equipments thus made emblematic of the sorrowful business of human slaughter. War is a very black art.

. . . Herbert Spencer, the famous writer on sociological and philosophical subjects, died at his home in Brighton, England, on December 8th. Spencer held strongly, on purely evolutionary grounds, that war is now entirely out of date, and ought to disappear from human society.